

## **REMARKS**

### **1. Status of Claims**

Claims 1 – 25, 29, 39 and 40 were previously cancelled. Claims 26 – 28, 30 – 38, 40 – 48, and 50 - 58 are pending. Claims 26, 36 and 46 are amended. These amendments are supported throughout the specification and original claims. No new matter has been added with these amendments.

All amendments and cancellations presented herein are made solely to expedite prosecution of the application without admission as to the propriety of the rejections set forth in the Office Action and without acquiescence to the Examiner's characterization of the claims or the art cited herein. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to include claims of the same or different scope as previously written in one or more continuing applications.

### **2. Claim Rejections**

Claims 26-28, 33, 36-38, 43, 46-48, 53 and 56 – 58 stand rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0002530 to May in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0087454 to Calo. Claims 30-32, 40-42 and 50-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over May and Calo and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0033212 to Sandhu ("Sandhu"). Claims 34-35, 44-45 and 54-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over May and Calo and further in view of Official Notice.

Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

Claim 26, as amended, requires one or more client devices operable to display an interface and receive by way of entry into the interface information concerning one or more deals

from one or more users, the received information identifying a party, a counterparty, and one or more product types ... each product type having a corresponding template with a plurality of data entry fields, each template simplifying entry of information into the interface by assigning a default value to one of the plurality of data entry fields based on the product type and by assigning a default value to one of the plurality of data entry fields based on the received information. Claims 36 and 46 recite similar features.

May does not disclose, at least, these limitations. The Office Action alleges that May's Fig. 2 shows the claimed interface. See Office Action page 3. However, May's Fig. 2 is merely a chat screen used for two-way negotiation. See May's Fig. 2 and para. [0030]. May's Fig. 2 fails to disclose that the chat screen has a corresponding template for each product type or the ability to assign default values based on the product type or the received information from the user.

May also discloses that once the parties have decided on terms of a trade during a chat session, either one can then initiate a trade ticket by selecting a button that launches an instrument selection screen. See May's Fig. 3 and para. [0033]. The instrument selection screen "allows the user to (1) select from one or more drop-down menus 36 (for example) the type of financial instrument (e.g., class, currency and/or symbol) being traded and (2) select the appropriate terms of the transaction via selectable options 38". See May's Fig. 3 and para. [0033].

May fails to disclose that the instrument selection screen has a corresponding template for each product type or the ability to assign default values based on the product type or the received information from the user.

In addition, May discloses that that once the trader has selected the instrument, the trader may select a generate button which launches an order generate screen. See May's Fig. 4 and para. [0034]. The order generate screen "presents the selected instrument in window 52, and enables the traders to select the specific contract and terms via selectable options 54." Once the contract and terms are entered, a trader may select a generate button, which generates a trade ticket that is sent to both parties. See May's paras. [0034] - [0039].

For the same reasons stated above, May fails to disclose that the order generate screen has a corresponding template for each product type or the ability to assign default values based on the product type or the received information from the user.

Additionally, with regard to the independent claims, Calo and Sandu fail to cure the deficiencies of May.

In addition, the dependent claims are patentable at least for their dependence on the allowable independent claims as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, for at least the above-cited reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable over the cited art.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response; the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

Please charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this response to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310 (101612-5010-US-01). If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: January 27, 2012

By: /Michael S. Ryan/  
Michael S. Ryan  
Reg. No. 63,115  
Alison B. Weisberg  
Reg. No. 45,206

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
**Customer No.: 28977**  
1701 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19003  
Telephone: 215.963.4964 (5091)